Library

# WE THE MACEDONIANS

*By* CONSTANTINE STEPHANOVE, *B. A., M. A., Yale*
Secretary General Macedonian Council for Switzerland, Member American Geographical Society, Etc.

REPRINTED BY THE MACEDONO-BULGARIAN CENTRAL COMMITTEE, CHICAGO, ILL., 1919.

In the issue of the *Times,* December 24, last, Prof. Spenser Wilkinson has touched upon one of the most intricate questions—that of the "New Boundaries" in the Balkans—which the Peace Conference will have to solve, the sooner the better.

Prof. Wilkinson, though admitting that "a more difficult and delicate problem can hardly be imagined, for its solution requires a combination of historical and geographical knowledge which hardly any man so completely possess," etc., nevertheless, seems to have encountered no very serious obstacles in drawing up the future limits of Greece, as is evident from his statement that, "The region of predominantly Greek population can be defined with sufficient accuracy. It embraces a region bounded on the east by the Turkish portion of the Asia Minor, and on the north by the two large blocks of Bulgarians and Serbians and by the much smaller group of Albanians who seem less sharply distinguished from the Greeks than either Turks, Bulgarians, or Serbs, for there are districts in Greece, even in Attica, where men of Albanian speech and race appear to be politically completely Hellenized." I leave to competent ethnographers, geographers, and historians to adjudge with what "sufficient accuracy" Prof. Wilkinson has rushed the future ethnical lines of Greece from "the Adriatic on the west and the Turkish highlands of Asia Minor on the

east!'' At the same time, Mehmed Bey Konitza, Essad Pasha, Gregor M. Tsilka, Lord Lamington, Mr. H. W. Nevinson, Miss Durham, etc., may be referred to as to how far a Hellenized Albanian possesses a Greek soul.

As a Macedonian, I am more interested in what Prof. Wilkinson has to say about the future of that unhappy land. I was more than astonished to read these rather incongruous sentences: ''In the north the Greeks and the Serbs can probably reach an amicable agreement, but the Bulgarians have twice made themselves the tools of the Central Powers against all their neighbors. In the last Balkan War they treacherously attacked both Greeks and Serbs * * * they owe their liberation not as do the Greeks and the Serbs to their own bravery, but solely to the political ambition of the now extinct Russian Empire.'' This is, indeed, a fine rhetorical flourish, but it does not in the least betray ''a combination of historical and geographical knowledge.'' It is not my purpose to exonerate this or that Bulgarian Government, but perhaps Prof. Wilkinson's attention may be called to the fact that the Bulgarian rash act in June 29, 1913, was preceded by a systematic persecution and extermination of the Bulgarian population in Macedonia by the Serbian and Greek authorities,[1] by covert dealings between Serbia and Greece, the aim of which was not unknown to all the foreign consuls at Salonica, by the ''unofficial'' and hasty visit of Prince Alexander to the Greek King in December, 1912, by the guarded Serbian note circulated as early as January, 1913, in which the Serbian Government urged their respective diplomatic representatives to do all in their power to spread abroad the conviction that the territory occupied by the Serbian army

[1]Mr. H. N. Brailsford thus described the deplorable state of that country under the Serbians in 1913: "The situation grows more and more unbearable, for the Bulgarians—a perfect hell. I had opportunity of talking with peasants from the interior. What they tell us makes one shudder. Every group of four or five villages has an official placed over it who, with six or seven underlings, men of disreputable antecedents, carries out perquisitions, and on the pretext of searching for arms steals everything that is worth taking. They indulge in flogging and robbery, and violate many of the women and girls. * * * Bands of Servian terrorists (*komitadjis*) recruited by the Government swarm all over the country. They go from village to village and woe to any one who dares to refuse them anything." (*Manchester Guardian*, Nov. 8, 1913.)

is a legitimate Serbian possession, already hinting at a revision of the Serbo-Bulgarian Treaty, the dilly-dallying of the Serbian and Greek peace delegates at London, which conduct justly elicited Sir Edward Grey's paternal admonition to "return home," the speedy digging up of entrenchments by the same two allies, facing Bulgarian territory, the secret Greeko-Serbian Treaty finally ratified on May, 1913,[1] and lastly the bloody incident at the Macedonian village Zletovo, on June, 1916, following, caused by the Serbian outrage perpetrated on the women folk, which incited their husbands, brothers, and fathers to rush in rescue of their kindred. Prof. Wilkinson has either forgotten, or may have disregarded the verdict of the Carnegie International Investigation Commission, which declared just the contrary, *"Bulgaria is the victim of her treacherous neighbors and of the intrigues of some of the Great Powers,"* and of the testimony of the *Times,* in one of its July (1913) numbers, which stated that *"The object of the enemies of Bulgaria is to besmear her with so much mud hoping that at least some of it may stick."* The eminent gentlemen who made up that Carnegie International Commission have given the following explanation for the hatred and jealousy of Bulgaria's neighbors: *"The Servian-soldier, like the Greek, was firmly persuaded that in Macedonia he would find compatriots, men who could speak his language and address him with jivio or zito. He found men speaking a language different from his, who cried hurrah! The theory he had learned from youth of the existence of a Servian Macedonia, and a Greek Macedonia, naturally suffered, but his patriotic conviction that Macedonia must become Greek or Servian remained unaffected. Accordingly, he acted upon this basis."*

Mr. Frank Fox in his recent work on Bulgaria surely possesses a prophetic "historical and geographical knowledge," when in speaking on this subject, he says that the Balkan Alliance was ruined because "the selfish interests of Europe were not served by the League * * * an actively benevolent Europe acting with firmness and impartiality would have suc-

[1]See *Le livre blanc grec* (XIII), 1913—1917.

ceeded in keeping the League together and saving the series of fratricidal wars which began in 1913, and will be continued as soon as the present exhaustion has been relieved."

But my main point is the query, "How can a person like Prof. Wilkinson imagine that the fate of my native land Macedonia may be decided easily and 'amicably between Serbia and Greece?'" Does he think that the nationality principle, or the principle of self-determination, for the realization of which President Wilson and America entered the war against the Prussian militarism, does not apply to the Macedonians, who have made far greater sacrifices in their struggle for human rights than the people of Bucovina, Bessarabia, Dalmatia, Slovakia, etc., whose recent history is a series of fierce revolts for freedom, and whose signal revolution of 1903 shook the foundations of the Ottoman Empire?

### Macedonians Not to Be Treated as Chattels

Are we, two million of sturdy Macedonians, to be treated by Greece and Serbia as *chattels,* against which term President Wilson cherishes a nauseous disliking? Is the League of Nations which is to establish "a new order of things" to disregard the desire of the Macedonians as to the question of their future form of government? Must one inform Mr. Wilkinson that it was the gigantic mass-meetings held in Sofia by the Macedonian refugees and their leaders that in 1912 strengthened the hands of the Gheshoff Government and encouraged him in bringing to a head the Balkan alliance? It may appear a new fact to many, if they are told that it was again the unbearable régime in Macedonia since 1913 causing the flight of all who could, and the half a million of Macedonians found in Bulgaria that tipped the scale and encouraged the decision of Tzar Ferdinand and his Minister Radoslavoff to plunge their country in the great conflict. Here I may avail myself of the opportunity to acquaint Prof. Wilkinson with the fact that the writer of these lines, a month before the Serbo-Bulgarian conflict, was delegated by the Sofia Macedonian circles to England, the most trusted friend of the op-

pressed peoples, to inform the British Government that the state of affairs in Macedonia is unendurable, that the popular indignation of the Bulgarians is reaching such a high pitch that it may be stayed only temporarily, that Bulgaria would be compelled to yield to the pressure of the Central Powers only because it can no longer remain passive to the persecution and sufferings of her kindred in Macedonia. The Macedonian circles which are all powerful in Sofia requested me to inform the British Foreign Office that should England occupy Macedonia with even five thousand of her troops and put an end to the deplorable state of the Bulgarians there, the English forces would be welcomed as liberators throughout Macedonia and Bulgaria, and that such an act on the part of the Entente would produce such a magic effect in Bulgaria that neither Tsar nor Government would be able to remain one day in the country in any other capacity than as friends and allies of the liberators of the Macedonians. My mission to England was no secret to many of my English friends. It was known to Mr. O'Berne, the British Minister at Sofia, who was greatly in sympathy with it, and who frankly admitted the slow, awkward and fumbling diplomacy of the Entente, entrusted in the hands of highly incapable and blunderous Tsarist agents. Why the British and the Entente Powers did not profit by this suggestion and earnest request of the pro-English Macedonia and Bulgaria is a question for the historian of the future to discover. One thing I can vouch for is that at the Foreign Office they were fully informed of the deplorable condition existing in Macedonia.

In one sense it is true that "Bulgaria played a tool of the Central Powers"; as a matter of fact, however, all small states are in one way or another tools of the bigger ones. Especially is this so of the Balkan states. Roumania was pro-German until the Russian Cossacks crossed over her boundaries and facilitated the mission of the Roumanian Ententists. Greece had to invent a new diplomatic term, that of "utrality," which meant "heads Constantine," "tails Venizelos,"—"I win." King Nickita and his son, Prince Danailo, played the game no

less dexterously. As to the Serbians, while their heroic phalanxes were struggling on the Salonica front side by side with the Italians, their twice as numerous brethren, the Serbo-Croates, in the meanwhile were administering staggering blows to King Emmanuel's warriors at Isonzo, and it seems they will not cease doing it for a long time to come. General Boroevic, Austria's greatest general and Italy's worst enemy, is to-day a most popular hero in Yougo-Slavdom. And, *mirabile dictu,* Prof. Zhogler, the tutor of Emperor Karl, and one of the Seidel Ministers, as well as Schmaller, the Tchech socialist leader, who signed the congratulatory telegram to General Boroevic on the occasion of his signal Piave victory over the Italians last year, are two of the delegates designated for the Peace Conference at Paris!

It is a very interesting psychological question to know why Bulgaria's actions to save her own should be always branded as "treacherous," while Roumania's invasion of her southern neighbor in 1913, her onset upon Austro-Hungary in 1915, or Italy's war upon her former ally, the Greek onrush against its northern enemy, or the Serbo-Croat continuous assaults upon Italy, are to be characterized as "loyal" or "valiant" actions? Is it criminal to save one's child from the grip of a ravisher? Many an Englishman familiar with Bulgaria's situation has confessed to me that no country under the provocations she was exposed would have restrained itself as much and as long.

The fault of Bulgaria is that she attacked Serbia, who was oppressing her kindred, and who had, contrary to treaty stipulations, snatched Macedonia from her in 1913. To free one's kin from tyranny is never criminal or out of season. Bulgaria plunged in the war against Turkey in 1912 to free her own in Macedonia, made or was compelled to make the June attack on Serbia for the deliverance of Macedonia, was constrained to join the Central Powers explicitly for Macedonia. The most democratic people in the Balkans was simply thrust over into the hands of Prussianism, because the Tsarist Government was allowed a free hand in the Balkans, and because

when Bulgaria had first turned to the Western democracies for a sorely needed loan to repair her losses from the Balkan wars, at Paris and London she was told, "The road to a loan leads via Petrograd," while at Petrograd her delegates were received with worse insults—"Bulgaria is thoroughly exhausted, she has no more an army, she can have no loan." Here was Germany's splendid chance.

Prof. Wilkinson may rest assured the Peace Conference, which will be guided by the principles of nationality, self-determination and true democracy, will not fail to effect the union of Macedonia and Bulgaria, or at least grant the Macedonians the privilege to decide their own fate, which inevitably will mean the same thing—a union of the two sister countries which from ancient times, and particularly since the fatal Berlin Congress 1878, have rebelled together, fought together and bled together at the altar of freedom. If that is not bravery, then Prof. Wilkinson must have a new conception of true valiancy. The testimony of the British soldiers of the Macedonian front, whom the Bulgarians were "compelled to kill lest they be killed," as the *Manchester Guardian* once fittingly put it, is that the Bulgarians are "no shurkers, b'Gad." "Whoever thinks the Bulgarians 'soft,' let him come over to our trenches in Macedonia and find out for himself," so declared some English soldiers who had returned home on furlough. Whatever may have been the relations between other belligerents, the British and Bulgar warriors were, certainly, the most loyal enemies in the whole war. The English chivalrous conduct both in action and in the rear had done more to conquer the democratic Bulgarians than their long Toms and rapid-firers. On more than one grave of a fallen Bulgarian, abandoned by the English troops, the Bulgarians were most deeply affected at reading, "*Died fighting for his country,*" written by English soldiers.

Prof. Wilkinson is wrong about the ethnical boundaries he proposes for the Balkans, is wrong in imagining the Albanian a docile Hellenized convert, wrong in denying bravery to the Bulgars who have taken an active part in every revolutionary

movement in the Balkans, who crushed the Turkish main force in 1912, fought single-handed Serbia, Greece and Montenegro together with Roumania and Turkey at their back in 1913, performed miraculous exploits in 1915 and 1916, and he is most wrong in believing that "the Serbs and Greeks can reach an amicable agreement" in Macedonia, because, in the first place, it is the Macedonians themselves who will decide that supreme question.

### Macedonia's Ethnical Character Established by Scholars and Serious Writers Versed in the Subject

Space does not permit me to go into detail, but one cannot go over his history without refreshing his memory on such an irrefragable testimony as that of Ami Boué, who as early as 1840, after a thorough study of the Balkan ethnical questions, wrote: *"The Bulgarians compose the main kernel of the population of Macedonia,"*[1] and reiterated by no lesser a Frenchman than Cyprien Robert, who in 1844 stated, *"This people (the Bulgarian) in reality constitutes the main kernel of the Macedonian population."* Shall I refer to Urquhart, Paton, Denton, Lord Strangford, and a host of other learned Englishmen who have studied the Balkan races on the very spot?

Did not Lord Strangford in 1862 declare: *"The vast and homogeneous majority of the Christian population in Europe, with the exception of Bosnia, Thessaly, Albania, the Chalcidic Peninsula, and a very narrow belt of seaboard, consists not of Greeks or Slavs, but of Bulgarians."*[2]

And here is another passage from the same English author which superbly fits the case to-day:

*"The Greek cannot overcome the Bulgarian, nor lead him, nor incorporate him."*[3]

And again:

*"The Serbs or certain Serbian circles believe and wish us to believe that they have the power and the moral right to*

[1] *La Turquie d'Europe*, Paris, 1840, vol. II, p. 5.
[2] *Les Slaves de la Turquie*, Paris, 1814, vol. II, p. 230.
[3] *The Eastern Shores of the Adriatic*, London, 1864, p. 316.

*annex, if not all, at least certain Bulgarian lands. They would neglect nothing in their efforts to work upon the Bulgarians and make them see things as they see them.*"[1]

In England there are perhaps few persons better acquainted with the nationality principle in South-Eastern Europe than Sir Arthur Evans, the fiery defender of the Yougoslav aspirations these days. Certainly the following statement made by that most erudite gentleman in the columns of the *Times,* after the great Macedonian revolution, was not made to please anybody but to recall a well established truth which Prof. Wilkinson seems to take lightly:

"The Bulgarian element predominates throughout the whole length and breadth of Macedonia. I use this expression because it embraces all the territory included between Epirus and Albania on one side, and Eastern Roumelia and the Principality of Bulgaria on the other. It is only in certain towns of the country south that one meets traces of a Greek element, but here, too, it has been neutralized and is completely lost among the Bulgarian village population. Salonica, the only important city in the Province, is inhabited chiefly by Spanish Jews and Mussulmans, but not by Greeks or Bulgarians. In Monastir also, the majority of the inhabitants is Bulgarian, and Bulgarian is the language in the market. Prilep, Uskub, Ishtib, Kratovo, Palanka, Stroumitza, Naglen, as well as the other interior towns, are exclusively Bulgarian. It is not through hearsay that I advance this truth, but as a result of personal travel. I will go still further and say that a traveler may traverse all of Macedonia, from Pindus Mountains to the Bulgarian frontier, without encountering a single Greek."

If Sir Arthur Evans' so signal adherence to facts is not convincing for Prof. Wilkinson, then what would he say to the no less categorical stand taken by the great French scholar Louis Léger, who in *La Grande Encyclopédie* declares:

"From a political point of view under the name of Bulgaria is meant: 1. The Principality of Bulgaria created by

[1]Ibid., p. 351.
[2]*The Eastern Shores of the Adriatic,* p. 351.
[3]*The Times,* Oct. 1, 1903.

the Berlin Treaty between the Danube and the Balkans, with Sofia for capital. 2. The group formed by this principality and the autonomous province of East Roumelia, united in consequence of the successful Philippopolis revolution in September, 1885. Of this group we shall treat here, but is well to remark that it does not embrace *all the Bulgarians in Macedonia and western Thrace,* destined in all probability to unite some day with their free brethren; *those of Dobroudja, left by the Berlin Treaty under Roumania;* and those of the districts of *Pirot, Nish* and *Vranya,* which the Berlin Treaty gave to Serbia."

And here is the view of perhaps the greatest authority on the subject, Dr. G. E. Washburn, for forty years president of Robert College. In his large volume, *Fifty Years in Constantinople,* one may find the following enlightening page containing the Eastern Question in a nutshell:

"The treaty of San Stefano was of course a hard one for Turkey, but it would have been better for England and for all the people of European Turkey if it had been allowed to stand.

"The Sultan himself had no reason to thank England or Austria for their intervention. The secret convention by which England acquired Cyprus was a little better than a theatrical trick of Lord Beaconsfield's. The treaty of Berlin, which was signed July 13, 1878, was one of the most important events of the nineteenth century in European history, but it was not made in the interest of any one in the Turkish Empire. I do not know that it professed to be, although Lord Beaconsfield congratulated himself on having "consolidated the Empire," an euphemism for having reduced the size of it. Each Power sought only to further its own interests and ambitions, and for the people chiefly concerned the result has been a succession of wars, revolutions and massacres down to the present day.

"* * * This is not the place to discuss the treaty, but we may take a single illustration from the people in whom the college was most interested at that time, the Bulgarians. The treaty of San Stefano had created a Bulgaria essentially on the lines agreed to by the Powers at the Conference of Con-

stantinople. The treaty of Berlin divided the Bulgarians into five sections, giving one part to Servia (*Nish,* etc.), one to Roumania (*Dobroudja*), one to an autonomous province called East Roumelia, one to Turkey (Macedonia), and one to constitute the Principality of Bulgaria under the suzerainty of the Sultan; and it was England especially that insisted upon this, and also upon the right of Turkey to occupy and fortify the range of the Balkans, all with the object of making it impossible for the Bulgarians to form a viable state, which might be friendly to Russia. The Englishmen who knew Bulgaria, all our friends, understood the folly and wickedness of this at the time. All England has learned it since. Thus far the results have been the revolution of 1885, which resulted in the union of Bulgaria and Eastern Roumelia, the war with Serbia, the insurrection in Macedonia and province of Adrianople, and all the massacres and unspeakable horrors of the last thirty-nine years—in Macedonia, to say nothing of what Bulgaria has suffered from the intrigues of foreign Powers ever since the treaty of Berlin. The awful massacres and persecutions from which the Armenians have suffered since 1886 have been equally the result of this treaty."[1]

And we may add the bloody revolutions of the Cretans and Macedonians, the Greek-Turkish war in 1897, the Balkan wars in 1912-13, and indirectly the present world conflagration.

In 1913, after the Greeks and Serbians had "amicably" solved the Macedonian problem, but had found it dangerous to allow the preponderating Bulgarian element to have its churches and schools open, the Balkan Branch of the American Missions was constrained to send to Sir Edward Grey, and to the prime ministers of the other Great Powers, the following note of protest, which speaks for itself:

"Sir,—it is a well known fact that for more than fifty years American Protestant missionaries have carried on religious and educational work in various parts of the Balkan Peninsula. In this work they have been without political purposes or political alliances, and, on principle, have consistently

[1] *Fifty Years in Constantinople,* pp. 183, 184.

avoided all interference in political affairs. In view of these facts, a brief statement as to the places where this work has been conducted, the people among whom it has been conducted, and the manner of conducting it, may be of value at this time when the fate of large portions of the Balkan Peninsula is about to be decided.

"About the middle of last century the attention of American missionaries in Constantinople was attracted *to the Bulgarian peasants in and about that city,* and the impression made by them was so favorable that it was decided to investigate the region from which they came. This investigation was made in the late fifties, and its result was that religious societies in Great Britain and the United States of America decided to inaugurate missionary work in the Balkan Peninsula, mainly among the Bulgarians. The Methodist Episcopal Church of North America took as its field the region between the Danube and the Balkan Mountains, and began its work in 1857; while the region south of the Balkans was assigned to the Missionary Society of the Congregational Churches of America, which society sent out its first missionaries in 1858.

"These missionaries located at Adrianople. Others followed them, and in turn Stara Zagora, Philippopolis, Sofia and Samokov were occupied before 1870. The work was extended to the Razlog district, and in 1871 the first Bulgarian Protestant church was organized in Bansko.

"*In 1873, after a tour of investigation, the City of Monastir was selected as the most favorable center for work in Macedonia,* and in the fall of that year two missionary families were located there. From this center the work was extended all through Macedonia, and churches or preaching stations were established in Monastir, Ressen, Prilep, Vodena, Vardar Enije, Kafadartsi, Velles, Skopia, Prishtina, Radovish, Raklish, Strumitsa and its villages, Velusa and Monospitovo. In 1894, after the opening up of the railway lines which converge upon Salonica, that city was made a new center of work with supervision over the outlying districts, from Mitrovitsa on the northwest and Mehomia on the north, to Drama on the

east. New preaching stations were established in Koleshnitsa, Doiran, Koukoush with its villages Todorak and Mezhdurek, Gurmen (Nevrokop district), Drama, Tetovo and Mitrovitsa.

"Although it was originally the plan of the Mission to work among the Mohammedans of European Turkey as well as among the Bulgarians, as a matter of fact the work has been confined, with the exception of the recently established Albanian branch, almost exclusively to the Bulgarians. *The Bible was translated into modern colloquial Bulgarian, and has been circulated all through Bulgaria, Macedonia and Thrace.* Over six hundred hymns and sacred songs have been prepared in Bulgarian for the use of the religious communities connected with the Mission in Bulgaria and Macedonia. *The literature of the Mission is prepared in Bulgarian. The language of preaching in all the places of assembly, except* Prishtina and Mitrovitsa, where Servian is used, *is Bulgarian.* Schools of gymnasium rank have been established in Samokov and Monastir, and an Agricultural and Industrial Institute in Salonica. Primary schools have long been maintained by the Mission in many cities and villages in Bulgaria, and in the following places in Macedonia: Monastir, Todorak and Mezhdurek (Koukoush district), Vardar Enije, Koleshino, Monospitovo and Strumitsa, Drama, Bansko, Banya, Mehomia and Eleshnitsa in the Razlog district. In all these places the language of instruction has been, and is, Bulgarian, although English has also been introduced of late years in the Girls' Boarding School of Monastir.

"*After years of acquaintance with Macedonia, either through residence or travel, or both mingling with the people and living in their homes, we are fully convinced that the great bulk of the population in the region which we have indicated as the Macedonian field of our work, is Bulgarian in origin, language and customs, and forms an integral part of the Bulgarian nation.*

"*We desire to call your Excellency's attention to this simple statement of facts with the hope that it may be of some assistance in securing a just and righteous solution of the*

*momentous problem of Macedonia's future;* and we also hope that, whatever the solution may be, the necessary measures will be taken to guarantee full religious liberty for all under the new administration of the country, and to insure the same freedom to carry on religious and educational work which has been enjoyed in the past.

"A statement identical with this has been sent to the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of all the Great Powers.

Samokov (Bulgaria), August 5th, 1913.

Signed:—

J. F. Clarke, D. D., *Missionary in European Turkey for 54 years.*

J. W. Baird, D. D., *Missionary in European Turkey for 40 years.*

Robert Thomson, of Edinburgh, *Missionary for 30 years in Constantinople and European Turkey."*

In view of the above historical data, and in view of the repeated declarations of responsible English statesmen that Britain stands firm in her decision to *"secure agreement between the Balkan states, without sacrificing the independence of any of them,"* and President Wilson's third and fourth points of his February programme, which read: (3) *"Every territorial settlement must be made in the interest and for the benefit of the population concerned and not as part of any mere adjustment or compromise of claims among rival states,"* and (4) *"All well defined national aspirations shall be accorded the utmost satisfaction without introducing new or perpetuating old elements of discord and antagonism that would be likely to break the peace of Europe, and consequently of the world,"* how can Prof. Wilkinson be justified in making the assertion that the fate of Macedonia is to be decided by a mere Greek and Serbian "amicable agreement"?

## Europe's Responsibility

It was only recently, at the collapse of Turkey, that Mr. A. G. Gardiner, voicing the sentiment of nearly the entire public in England, wrote in the London *Daily News* these remarkable lines:

"The story of Britain's relations with Turkey, both in diplomacy and war, is the story of a series of mistakes for which a high price has invariably been paid. The supreme mistake is to be found in the obduracy of British diplomats on the Turkish question for more than half a century. We fought Russia and backed Turkey in a bad cause in 1854; we buttressed her up, in common with Continental diplomatists, in 1878, when Gladstone with unerring judgment demanded that she be expelled from Europe bag and baggage; and clear though the conscience of British statesmen may be of conscious complicity in the crimes of Turkish misgovernment, it cannot be questioned that but for the folly of British statesmanship the sphere of that misgovernment would long since have been drastically restricted. We stultified ourselves in common with other Powers at the time of the Armenian massacres, because of international jealousies which forbade either joint intervention, or individual action; and down to the eve of the present war, diplomatic duels with Germany over Turkish concessions threatened perpetually to precipitate the conflict into which Europe was ultimately plunged by other causes."[1]

The American press in general corroborated Mr. Gardiner's statements. We may be allowed to give but this quotation representing the view of the American public opinion on the same matter. *New York Times* in one of its editorials among other things wrote this concerning the British responsibility assumed at the Congress of Berlin, which made it possible for Turkey to continue its existence in Europe till this day:

"Thus possessed of Russia's intentions toward Turkey, England, in self-defense, took up the protection of that international vagabond. She was so thoroughly alarmed that she made the greatest mistake of the century at Berlin in 1878. The oppressed states of the Balkans had been throwing off the Turkish yoke and new nations were emerging in the Balkans. Russia took up their cause and attacked and defeated Turkey;

[1] *London Daily News*, Dec. 4, 1918.

and at San Stefano she made a treaty which would have created fairly large and powerful states, along race lines. But Disraeli, then at the head of the Government, and possessed by the idea that anything Russia proposed must be dangerous, succeeded at the Congress of Berlin in having this treaty thrown out, and *for it was substituted a miserable patchwork which arbitrarily cut the Balkan States into unnatural shapes and prepared the way for perpetual ferment in the Balkans.*"[1]

According to Prof. Wilkinson's plan of future Greece extending far up into Macedonia, and Serbia meeting her in the Vardar valley or even on the Aegean, Bulgaria is to be deprived of her most sacred ideals, her union with Macedonia, which is more Bulgarian than Bulgaria herself.

Can this be realized? We saw from the words of Dr. G. B. Washburn that Europe at the Berlin Congress in shattering the reunion of the Bulgarian race inaugurated an era of most bloody conflicts in the Balkans. This has been admitted by all practical and far-sighted statesmen in Europe and America, even during this war in which Bulgaria was treated as an enemy. It was only last year, and that when France was passing through her most trying times in this world conflict, that Georges Bousquet, the noted French publicist and honorary state councillor, was asked by the Paris Sociological Society to deliver a lecture on Bulgaria. That French writer and public man possesses a rare knowledge of the Balkan peoples, having spent a long time in their midst. The lecture is a masterpiece of the real French practical eloquence, an expression of a spirit of impartiality, love for truth, and reverence for the rights of nations. To an audience of distinguished listeners, perhaps, all thrilled with most intense hatred for a country that was fighting on the side of France's direst enemy, the fearless Frenchman, Georges Bousquet, impelled by the force of truth that must have long been laboring in his heart and mind, thundered out these, one may say, "blasphemous" words at his nerve-strung hearers:

"However, wise and pious monks copy and preserve the

[1]*New York Times*, Nov. 29, 1918.

archives of the politically fallen people in their cells, in the monastery of Rilo and of Mount Athos. There, in the day of national revival, the patriots will go to look for them. When he finds himself once more in 1872, the Bulgarian is weak to free himself by his own powers from the Ottoman yoke. Great Russia intervenes. She hastens to the rescue of the Slav brothers. And then, she herself is stifled, and strives to open the way through that country to the Mediterranean, to the open sea; the Turkish armies are beaten in two memorable campaigns, and it is at San Stefano, at the gates of Constantinople, that the Grand Duke Constantine dictates the treaty which reconstitutes Great Bulgaria, such as she was in the historical times of Tsar Samuel, extending from the Danube to the Aegean Sea and from the Black Sea to the borders of Serbia and Albania.

"Happy Bulgaria! happy Europe too, if the European Powers had adhered to that treaty, and had allowed the Bulgarian people to normally develop itself in this large territory, *which was their historical boundary, watered with the blood of their ancestors and peopled by their children!* We would have been spared many convulsions, and the present conflict would probably not have arisen, at any rate, not in its actual form and extent. But the evil genius of the XIXth century was on the wake. Bismarck was able to persuade Europe that this Bulgarian reconstitution was nothing but a Russian aggrandisement threatening the European equilibrium; he succeeded to persuade even Russia that in creating at her door a young and powerful empire she was eventually preparing a dangerous support for the enemies who might wish to attack her on that side; and the Berlin Treaty, in 1878, destroying the logical and harmonious work of San Stefano, divided Bulgaria into three parts: Macedonia in the south, which was left in Turkish barbarism; in the north the mutilated Principality of Bulgaria, which was declared independent under the vague suzerainty of the Sultan, and the strip of intermediary land, for which a new designation had to be invented—East Roumelia, and which was to enjoy an administrative autonomy under the political sovereignty of the Porte.

"From that day dates the Bulgarian irredentism, and the impatience with which for forty-four years France and Alsace-Lorraine have stood with outstretched hands towards each other gives you but a faint idea of the irresistible impulse of these three parts, violently and artificially separated.

"Now this patriotic enthusiasm had one concrete definite object, proclaimed since the emancipation of Bulgaria in 1878, constantly re-echoed ever since the spoliation of the Berlin Treaty, namely: to recover the Bulgarian part of Macedonia from the mouth of the Maritza to Bitolia. And now imagine the despair of the people: this object the Bulgarian attained at the price of his blood in 1913. He drove out the Turks. He let his horses drink of the water of the Vardar. He entered Seres, which is his Mulhausen! He entered Drama, which was his Strassburg! He entered Salonica, which was his Metz! And then as a result of a mean aggression of his trans-Danubian neighbors, he lost everything, and the treaty of Bucharest renewed the iniquity of Berlin.

"This treaty the Bulgarian never accepted in his inmost soul, no more than we accepted the treaty of Frankfurt; he swore that he would go with him who would tear it up.

"Ah! how he wished we might be that people! And how easy it would have been, if we had known how to speak and act in time in order to draw to us the Bulgarian people, all the scholars of whom speak our language, and their army which was taught by our officers how to manage the Creusot canons which we sold to them. But we failed to do all that. And now justice requires that we secure to Bulgaria these very territories which in their secret conventions in 1912 their allies acknowledged to belong to them. *To this solution the Entente will have to come, because it is right, it is logical, it is the normal and unalterable application of the principle of nationalities, for which we are fighting.* Woe to us! Woe to our descendants, if under the walls of the European fortress we are to erect to-morrow, is buried the one Bulgarian desire. Be sure the Bulgarian would blow up that fortress."

The Macedonian question which is the key to the Eastern

question has but one solution, as has been so conclusively pointed out by Edward Freemann, Wm. Miller, Arthur Evans, E. L. Curtis, Prof. Will. S. Monroe and all men well acquainted with the Balkan history. A future Peace Conference in dealing with the Balkan conflicts should have in view the following historical data, if it is to be guided by the principal of nationalities and the right of a people to determine its own form of government.

### Macedonia and Bulgaria Parts of a Whole

Macedonia, not Bulgaria, is the cradle of Bulgarian national awakening and regeneration. Bulgaria and Macedonia, beginning from the seventh century down to the present day, with the exception of some fifty years during the fourteenth century in which Macedonia was held by Servian rulers as *subject-territory,* have considered themselves as parts of the same country. During the Byzantine rule, in 1018-1186, Bulgaria and Macedonia, though under Byzantium, nevertheless, always had their autonomous existence as a nation recognized by the latter, while during the long Ottoman domination, 1371-1878-1912, the people inhabiting both provinces were treated as one and the same people, not only by the Turkish Government, but by the neighboring states, as also by all serious and impartial authors versed in the subject.

The Bulgarian greatest religious apostles, Cyril and Methodius, were Macedonians. They, besides converting the Bulgarian to Christianity, translated the Scriptures in the Macedonians' dialect of Salonica, which according to the testimony of the greatest of modern Byzantine investigators, Prof. J. M. Bury, "was the common language of both Macedonia and Bulgaria," and in the words of Gibbon "was in the tenth century enrolled among the civilized nations."

The city of Ochrida is known as the Bulgarian Mecca or Jerusalem. Thanks to the Macedonian educators Clement, Gorazd, Naum and others, and to the Ochrida Archbishopric which survived until 1676, the Bulgarian national feeling and self-consciousness never died out.

In 1762 the Macedonian Monk Paissi resumed the work of his predecessors, and by his history of Bulgaria infused new life into his countrymen throughout the Balkans. The Macedonian cities of Ochrida, Monastir, Uskub, Prilep, Veles, Stip, etc., became the leading centres of Bulgarian learning and culture.

Bulgaria's greatest educators and scholars, like Neophyte Rilsky, Purlitcheff, the poet Jinziphoff, the Miladinoff brothers, were all born Macedonians.

The first Bulgarian printing press was founded in Macedonia.

The decision of the Congress of Berlin to give Macedonia over to the Turk again became the signal for the awakening of the Macedonian revolutionary movement which soon became so powerful that since 1897 it was virtually the ruler in Macedonia and in the District of Adrianopole.

Its Illinden Insurrection in 1903, the anniversary of which was most solemnly celebrated in Skopie last year, virtually settled the fate of the Ottoman Empire for it drew the interference of the Great Powers with their reform programmes for Macedonia. In 1908 the Young Turkish leaders, Major Niasi and Enver Bey relying chiefly on the assistance of the Macedonian Revolutionary Organization, struck the old régime down and inaugurated the Turkish *Huriet.*

The Bulgarians alone have worked for an autonomous Macedonia; all other interested parties were always for its division. In 1912 it was mainly through the influence of Macedonian factors in Bulgaria that the Balkan Alliance was hastened, and thanks to the Macedonian officers and soldiers, as well as to the Macedonian trained revolutionary bands, that Turkey was taken off her feet and Tshataldja reached within a fortnight.

The zeal with which Bulgaria liberated Macedonia in 1915 was again mainly due to the Macedonian spirit that thrilled both the army and people in Bulgaria, without which the Bulgarian successes on the battlefield would have been impossible.

Bulgaria, whose cabinets have always included Macedoni-

ans among their members, a large number of whose officials, army officers, deputies, professors, lawyers, physicians, merchants, etc., are of Macedonian origin, is like a fortress conquered from within by the Macedonians. It was an Englishman who once aptly put it, that it is not so much a question whether Bulgaria is to annex Macedonia, as to whether Macedonia is to annex Bulgaria. It is enough to mention here that to-day the chief Food Controller, General Protogheroff, is a Macedonian, the late General Jostoff, Chief of the General Staff, was a Macedonian, the ministers Lyaptcheff and Djidroff are Macedonians, the Rector of the Sofia University, Prof. Gheorgoff, is a Macedonian, the President of the Bulgarian Supreme Court Karandjouloff, a Robert College graduate, is a Macedonian, and curious enough, also the two *parlamenteurs* at the Armistice, not to speak of hundreds of other men and women of Macedonian descent who at this hour occupy important posts in free Bulgaria.

### Documental Evidences

The claim of Bulgaria and Macedonia to be one, as is evident, is a traditional one. Moreover, it may be fit here to call attention to the following documental facts:

1. Since early times when the Bulgarian nation came into existence and established itself as an independent state, and during its Byzantine, Serbian, and Turkish bondage, the Bulgarian ethnic physiognomy of Macedonia and Bulgaria Morava has been attested by numerous historical documents.

2. All monuments and manuscripts from the ninth century onward testify that the old Slavic language is the Bulgaro-Macedonian dialect upon which was built up an extensive literature, and which later on was carried into Serbia and Russia, thereby laying the foundation of the literature of those Slavic countries.

3. The spiritual awakening of the Bulgarian people during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries began in Macedonia, the ardent pioneers, teachers, and writers of which were

Macedonian Bulgarians, chief among whom stands the venerable historian, Father Paissi.

4. The Bulgarian character of the population of Macedonia has been corroborated by all serious, thorough and unbiased scholars conversant with the subject, including Serbian and Greek writers.

5. The Report concerning the Bulgarian character of Macedonia and Bulgarian Morava prepared in 1858 for the Vienna Government by the Austrian consul and writer, J. von Hahn.

6. In 1838 and 1856 by special firman the Sublime Porte had recognized certain rights to the Christian races found in the Ottoman Empire. In 1870 with the creation of the Bulgarian National Church, Turkey virtually recognized the ethnical boundaries of the Bulgarian people, including Macedonia.

7. The Serbo-Bulgarian Treaty of 1867, according to which Bulgaria is included in the future Yougo-Slav Federation as an independent member and as a state comprising the three provinces of Mœsia, Thrace and Macedonia.

8. The Sultan's *firman* of 1870 in which are delineated and sanctioned the racial limits of the Bulgarian Exarchate, which includes also Macedonia, besides the Eparchies of Nish and Pirot in Bulgarian Morava, as well as the Toultcha Eparchy in northern Dobroudja.

9. The Turkish Balkan Archives.

10. The Organic Statute of the Constantinople Conference of 1876 convoked at the initiative of Lord Derby, according to which future Bulgaria was to include Macedonia and the Nish and Toultcha districts.

11. The San Stefano Treaty of 1877 based practically on the decisions of the representatives of the Constantinople Conference.

12. The Protocols of the Berlin Treaty in which Macedonia is referred to as Bulgarian.

13. The general and local Bulgarian insurrections in Macedonia—the Maleshevo in 1876, the Kresna in 1878, that of Ochrida in 1881, the one of Pirrin in 1895, the Vinitza in 1897,

the Melnik in 1902, and the Bitolia or Illinden Insurrection, the greatest of them all, in 1903, in which took part more than 30,000 Bulgarian Macedonians.

14. The Mürzsteg Reform Plan for Macedonia.

15. The Reval Reform Programme for Macedonia.

16. The Reports of the special English, Austrian, Italian, Russian, and French officers attached to the respective diplomatic agencies of the Great Powers at Salonica, in which reports they unanimously attest the fact that the great majority of the Macedonian population is Bulgarian.

17. The Serbo-Bulgarian Treaty of 1913 in which the Serbians solemnly recognized that Macedonia is Bulgarian.

18. The London Conference of 1913 which was a sanction of the Serbo-Bulgarian Treaty, and which set up Midia-Enos as the future boundary line between Bulgaria and Turkey.

19. The Carnegie Balkan Investigation Commission in 1913 is a fresh and irrefragable document of the intimate bounds existing between Macedonia and Bulgaria.

20. The Memorandum of the American Missionaries of European Turkey, addressed in 1913 to the Cabinets of the Great Powers, in which they declare that their duty to justice prompted them to emphasize the Bulgarian character of Macedonia, and thus facilitate a just solution of the Macedonian Question.

21. The statistics of the Bulgarian churches and schools in Macedonia, according to which the Bulgarians in 1910 possessed 1,359 schools with 79,519 pupils, 1,201 churches and monasteries with 1,132 priests. The number of Bulgarian schoolboys and girls in Macedonia under the Turks, even at that date, was proportionally far greater than the number of the school youth in the adjacent countries of free Serbia and Greece.

It would be a flagrant violation of justice and the principles so clearly pointed out by President Wilson, if the desire of the Bulgarians for reunion be frustrated by cutting off from Bulgaria its sister provinces of Macedonia, North Do-

brudja, and Bulgarian Morava, especially when in the name of the same Wilsonian principles Serbia would be allowed to effect her union with her brethren in the west, Greece with her people in Epirus, the Islands, and probably in Asia Minor; Roumania with her kindred in Bessarabia, Transylvania, etc.

### Two Important Conditions

The solution of the Macedonian Question, as well as other Balkan race problems, and lasting peace in southeastern Europe, so strongly advocated by the Entente Powers and so necessary for the prosperity of the Balkan people, may only be realized under the following conditions based on President Wilson's principles:

*a*) The revision of the Berlin and Bucharest (1913) treaties, which are the source of all strifes, revolutions and calamities in the Balkans. As a criterion for the revision should serve the principles contained in the 11th point of the programme enunciated by President Wilson. At the ethnical delimitation of the Balkan States the economical and geographical requirements of each state should also be had in view.

*b*) The recognition of the ethnical and historial fact that the Balkan peoples are only the Bulgarians, the Greeks, the Serbians and the Albanians. Since Roumania and Turkey, as a whole, live outside of the Balkan Peninsula, it is necessary for the peace and security of Europe, in general, and the Balkan States, in particular, that the latter should be protected by natural boundaries. Such a natural boundary line, between Roumania and Bulgaria, is the Danube. If on account of this or that consideration Roumania is allowed to remain in Dobroudja, and Turkey in Southern Thrace, the tendency would be such that considering themselves as Balkan States, they would ever strive to augment their territory at the expense of the other Balkan States, on the plausible ground of securing stronger strategic barriers. Under such circumstances a new imperialistic danger would be created—an evil against which the Entente Powers are fighting to-day. Such

a territorial arrangement would be a constant menace to the tranquil development of the Balkan Nations and to universal peace. No serious reasons can be raised by either Roumania or Turkey against the ethnical and geographical delimitation of the Balkan Peninsula. The Turks are transient rulers. They are not a steady agricultural element and landowners as are, for example, the Bulgarians, who, during all the cataclysms to which the Balkan Peninsula had been exposed for centuries, have never ceased to be true children of the soil and to retain their state of independent farmers. Roumanian statesmen and publicists themselves have repeatedly declared that Roumania is not a Balkan country.

A just application of the principle of nationalities, indeed, may encounter a strong opposition in northeastern Macedonia and in Bulgarian Morava on the part of the Serbs, and in southwestern Macedonia or the Seres and Drama districts on the part of the Greeks. Such a resistance, however, will have to face the 11th point of President Wilson's peace proposition, which is based on traditions and on the new history of the Balkans. In regard to the Bulgarian character of Macedonia and Bulgarian Morava, so stubbornly contested by Greeks and Serbians, there exist numerous historical acts and evidences. It is more than clear that Bulgaria's and Macedonia's claim to reunion is in perfect accord with the principle of nationalities and self-determination. It has been already sanctioned by England, France, Germany, Austria and Italy at the Constantinople Conference in 1876, and indirectly at several occasions later on. America by virtue of the monumental evidence brought out by such of its citizens as Ed. L. Curtis, Dr. G. B. Washburn, Prof. Will Monroe, and corroborated by the Carnegie Balkan Investigation Commission and various missionary reports, has practically done the same.

Now that Bulgaria's neighbors, with the help of their great Allies, are achieving their unification in a manner far beyond their expectations, it is more than fit and just that heroic Macedonia should be allowed to avail herself of the same right which is now accorded to new lands like Bosnia, Herzegovina,

Dalmatia, Slavonica, etc. For all along in the many generations past she has been engaged in fighting nothing but alien rule and domination.

England, France and America, in their desire to be generous to their small allies can ill afford to be disloyal to their Great Principles upon which a just and permanent peace is to be established in the world in general, and in the Balkans in particular.

Only when all the Balkan States realize their full national unity will they be able to maintain their existence, either as separate states, or as worthy members, whether of a Balkan Confederacy, or a Yougoslav Federation. Should, however, imperialistic designs and foreign intrigues assume their former ascendency, as there are already symptoms of such, Europe must be prepared for new conflicts and cataclysms.

Fortunately, the work already accomplished and the decisions taken by the Peace Conference at Paris are sure evidences that all down-trodden and subjected races will be heard before their future fate is settled. As far as the Macedonian Question is concerned, we have seen ample proof that its solution will not depend on an "amicable agreement between Greece and Serbia," as Prof. Wilkinson is telling us. To the repeated appeals for recognition made by Yougo-Slavia which declared to "extend from Izonzo to Vardar," the Entente and America have answered to the effect that its status as a state has been recognized, but all territorial delimitations will be decided by a special commission appointed by the Conference, in conformity with the "wish of the peoples concerned."

After Mr. Venizelos had made his statement regarding Greek territorial interests in Europe and Asia Minor, the Conference passed the following resolution:

"It is agreed: That the questions raised in the statement by Mr. Venizelos on the Greek territorial interests in the peace settlement shall be referred for examination in the first instance to an expert committee composed of two representatives each of the United States of America, the British Empire, France and Italy.

"It shall be the duty of this committee to reduce the questions for decision within the narrowest possible limits and make recommendations for a just settlement.

"*The committee is authorized to consult representatives of the peoples concerned.*"

### The Wish of the Macedonians

The "wish *of the peoples concerned*" is a very different thing from an "amicable agreement" of two politically interested parties referred to by Prof. Wilkinson.

The Macedonians since 1878 have by their revolutionary struggles repeatedly and eloquently manifested what their wish and will is. The following memorandum recently sent to President Wilson, Sir Lloyd George, Premier Clemenceau and Signor Orlando is a fresh and irrefutable document as to the actual feelings and desire of the Macedonians. We introduce it here *verbatim:*

"After the world cataclysm which is destroying the political foundations of old Europe, the Powers composing the Entente are undertaking the heavy responsibility of introducing a new order of things based on right, justice and the principle of self-determination.

"In the now extinct Empire of the Tzars—without mentioning the case of Poland—every province is reclaiming its freedom and independence. In Austria-Hungary new states have sprung up and have been recognized. In the Ottoman Empire, Armenia, Mesopotamia, Syria, Arabia, etc., are on the way of becoming full autonomous states.

"One country, whose history during the last fifty years has been a continuous struggle for human rights and liberty, and which has made far greater sacrifices at the altar of freedom than some other states that have just been emancipated,—Macedonia,— is to-day anxiously awaiting an equitable solution of her fate.

"Article 23 of the Berlin Treaty of 1878 provided a series of administrative measures for the amelioration of the lot

of the Macedonians. The reforms, however, stipulated therein were never realized.

"In October, 1878, bloody revolts broke out at Kresna and Razlog, and in 1880 at Ochrida, Prilep, Demir-Hissar, Kroushevo, Ressen and Dibra. These outbreaks were put down by the Turkish authorities and soldiery in a most cruel and sanguinary manner, and thousands of Macedonians met a most wretched death or were deported to various fortresses in Asia Minor.

"These repressions on the part of the tyrannical Turkish Régime had no other effect than to intensify in the Macedonian population the determination to win a free and honorable existence even at the cost of terrible sacrifices and untold misery. The Macedonians, therefore, resumed their noble cause with redoubled force and did all in their power to compel the realization of the promises for reform stipulated in Art. 23 of the Berlin Treaty. But all their efforts were in vain. Their masters proved as hard and inhuman as ever, and the Powers signatories to that Treaty did little or nothing towards compelling the Turkish Government to execute the programme of reforms agreed to.

"Seeing that they could obtain no redress for their wrongs, either from the Ottoman Government or from the Concert of Europe, the Macedonians thereby set themselves at work to find means of their own for putting a stop to a most shameful and cruel yoke. In 1893, therefore, there came into existence the powerful *Interior Revolutionary Organization which welcomed into it all Macedonians without distinction of race or faith, men and women, children and old men, all united in one purpose to prepare for the day of a general uprising* against the Common Oppressor. The motto of the Interior Organization was: *Macedonia for the Macedonians.*

"The revolution long planned by this popular movement broke out in July, 1903. After a stubborn resistance it, too, was crushed and the Macedonian inhabitants were anew exposed to massacres, imprisonment, exile, torture and death, their homes were burned down and destroyed, and their prop-

erty pillaged, carried away, or confiscated. The terrible consequences from that insurrection were: 198 villages completely destroyed, hundreds of others sacked and pillaged, 82,221 houses burned, 170,000 people left without a shelter in the full blast of winter.

"What deserves to be noted in this insurrectionary action is the character of the proclamation issued for the occasion by the Revolutionary Organization. 'We resort to arms,' the proclamation ran, 'against the tyranny and inhuman bondage. We rise in the name of liberty and justice; our cause, consequently, stands above the narrow conception of nationality and religion. What we demand is liberty and independence for all.'

"The Revolutionary Committee at the same time had spread abroad a second manifest in which were set forth the demands of the Macedonian people, which were: (1) The nomination, with the assent of the Great Powers, of a Christian Governor-General, completely independent of the Sublime Porte; (2) the establishment of a collective and permanent International Control over the administration of Macedonia.

"With this proclamation addressed to the world, the leaders of the Revolutionary Movement emphasized the fact that the chief aim of their struggle was the realization of the principle of *Macedonia for the Macedonians.*

"The Macedonian Insurrection of 1903, though barren of any beneficial results for the unhappy country, at least frightened the Emperors of Russia and Austria, who soon, on September 30th following, met and drew the famous 'Mürzsteg Reform Plan' for Macedonia, which was simply intended to deceive the world and retard the liquidation of the Eastern Question until a moment favoring their political designs. The Macedonians, finding their hopes frustrated again, had no other alternative left but to renew their struggle against the Turk.

"The situation in the Balkans after the so-called Illinden Insurrection grew worse and worse. England, in the meanwhile, stepped in and at the royal interview between King

Edward VII and Emperor Nicholas at Reval in 1909, was drawn up the 'Reval Programme of Reforms.' Germany, however, finding such a scheme not to her liking, took the side of Abdul Hamid and encouraged him in his decision to resist the introduction of any reforms in his domains.

"The enthusiasm created by the inauguration of the Young Turk Régime and its constitution was of very short duration. All Christian peoples in the Ottoman Empire soon perceived that the *Huriet* was a sham and that the leaders of the Young Turk party had no sincere desire to see the Empire regenerated. The traditional system of discrimination, repression, persecution and extermination was now employed with more refined and concerted methods. Local revolts occurred in various parts of Macedonia, which were suppressed in the usual Turkish way.

"We may here remark that the failure of the insurrectionary actions undertaken by the Macedonians was mainly due to the rivalry between Russia and Austria-Hungary, which later on manifested itself in the conflicts between the Balkan States. The policy of Russia and Austria-Hungary was that by sowing discord among the small Balkan States to further their own selfish designs in the Near East.

"Austria by virtue of a secret treaty concluded between her and Serbia in 1880, succeeded in Bosnia and Herzegovina, in return for which Austria engaged herself to support her claims in Macedonia. The echo of this transaction was the fatal Bukharest Treaty of 1913. The greatest blunder, and even crime, committed by the diplomatists of the Balkan States was their division of Macedonia without consulting the wish of the population itself.

"This is in a nutshell the lamentable history of Macedonia during the last half hundred years. It is a period fraught with bitter conflicts, persecution, wholesale butchery, tears and devastations. What other land has shown more stubbornness, dogged tenacity, and fought more desperately for human rights and freedom? Even the frightful experiences and suffering of the Armenian people, in the course of the last dec-

ades, fade before the martyrdom the Macedonians were fated to go through.

"In pointing to the above record of trials and sufferings in their struggle for liberty, is it not evident that the Macedonians have shown themselves worthy of being accorded the right of deciding their own fate—a privilege granted to Dalmations, Croates, Slovenes, Tchecks, Armenians, Arabs, etc.? Must the Macedonian people be handled as chattels by their neighbors? We, the Macedonians, are firmly convinced that the great Democracies of the XXth century will come to our aid in our struggle for self-determination.

"What we ask for is not only our right, but also our imperative duty; it is the demand of the Macedonians that their voice may be heard before their future destiny is decided.

"We, the General Council of the Macedonian Societies in Switzerland, are fully convinced that a proper, just and lasting solution of the Macedonian Question may be found by giving to the Macedonian people, too, the opportunity to freely declare its will as to its future form of government, which may be effected—

1. By the occupation of the country by only American, French, English and Italian troops;

2. By permitting all Macedonian refugees abroad, without distinction of race and religion, to return to their homes unmolested, and to be allowed to participate in the organization and management of their country's state affairs;

3. By entrusting the local administration of Macedonia in the hands of the native inhabitants, under the control of the Army of Occupation.

"Firmly believing that the decisions taken in the future Peace Conference will be guided by actual facts, equity and impartiality, we gladly and unreservedly entrust our fate in the hands of its members, and avail ourselves of the present opportunity to wish the Peace Congress full success in its grand and epochal undertaking."

The above statement speaks for itself and is thoroughly in

unison with President Wilson's 3d point of his February programme, which reads: *"Every territorial settlement must be made in the interest and for the benefit of the populations concerned, and not as part of any mere adjustment or compromise of claims among rival states."*

Walter Clinton Jackson Library
THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT GREENSBORO
Special Collections & Rare Books

WORLD WAR I PAMPHLET COLLECTION